

solution lies not in withdrawal but in reaching out.

But that view is in danger of becoming irrelevant in the wake of a successful march expressly limited to Black men.

So we need to look at why it happened, and why it was so successful. I do not fully understand it. But I do know that the march reflects something deep and profound that is going on in America today.

An analogue to the march is the growth of the predominantly white promise keepers movement, which fills stadiums with masses of men affirming their faith and responsibilities.

There seems to be a yearning for spiritual renewal in America that crosses the racial divide and finds expression movements like the million man march, the promise keepers, and others.

Are these male-oriented movements reaction to the new role of women in our economic life and the change in family structures?

Do they derive from economic insecurity driven by vast technological changes that have shattered old certainties and economic relationships?

When people are caught in the throes of sweeping economic changes beyond their control, and when income inequality shakes their self-image, they often turn to spiritual pursuits and traditional values.

And where will such movements go from here? Will a withdrawal to spiritual concerns mean abandonment of such public concerns as economic justice and social integration?

One might understand the march's stress on atonement in that light. What is atonement? Does it presume that it is wrong to pursue the American dream of a little white house with green shutters and a white picket fence. A car in the garage. A TV in the den, beer in the cooler, tuition for the children. Two weeks at the beach and a debt-free estate?

That question is relevant because most of the marchers were middle class—they were younger, better educated, and more affluent than most Black people.

Did the march have a political component? The polls found that four out of five marchers were registered to vote. Will they retain their commitment to the political process and intensify it by getting others to register and vote?

Finally, I have to ask whether the march was just another one of those "feel-good" events, where people let off steam and marching substitutes for concrete action to change the root causes of their dilemma.

Words are no substitute for action. But the march was a form of action—people traveled to the Capital, disrupted their daily lives, pledged to act differently, and behaved with great dignity.

And yet, the march remains shrouded in ambiguity.

If I am right in thinking that it reflects something going on in America that transcends race, then we need to figure out what it is and how to use it positively for Black people and the Nation.

That's a job for the institutions in our community equipped with the researchers and know-how to do it—the joint center, Howard University, and other repositories of Black intellectual prowess. They can help us understand this new, elusive spirit of our times, and help us decide upon a course of action.

But as we do, we must also understand the roles and functions of the division of labor in our community, especially as they have changed since the 1960's.

For there are now five distinct new leadership classes that have arisen alongside the traditional ones of Du Bois' "Talented

Tenth," such as the Black church, the press, the colleges, and the civil rights groups.

These new leadership groups include:

One, Black elected officials, many of whose constituents are White, Hispanic, and Asian.

Two, managers of predominantly white institutions, ranging from school superintendents and police chiefs, to foundation heads, college presidents and cabinet officers.

Three, indigenous community leadership, whose local organizations represent welfare families, public housing tenants and other community-based entities, and whose backgrounds are similar to those of their constituents.

Four, black entrepreneurs who produce goods and services for markets that extend beyond the black community.

Five, blacks in corporate America, as exemplified by the Executive Leadership Council.

These new leadership groups all share the experience of negotiating the deep and sometimes treacherous waters of majority institutions. Thus, they are well situated to bring a wider perspective to the issue.

That perspective is necessary if we are to make progress without being ensnared in futile arguments about self-defeating separatism and blind nationalism.

The new leadership groups can help inoculate us against demagoguery and extremism. They can bring powerful assets such as resources, skills and knowledge of the world beyond the confines of dysfunctional communities. Hopefully they can help answer the question asked in such pain and wonder in the heart of the ghetto—"Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there?"

As we assess the march, we should recall the words written many years ago by the great black historian. Carter G. Woodson:

"The race needs workers, not leaders," Woodson wrote. "If we can finally succeed in translating the idea of leadership into that of service, we may find it possible to lift the negro to a higher level."

Perhaps that is the true meaning of the march—the yearning of so many black men to be of service to the community.

But what about those who were not invited to the march—black women, white people, Hispanics, Asians—all of whom must participate in America's renewal and in bridging the gap between the races.

They must not be ignored, for the gap cannot be closed without them—because the only sane course of action lies within the context of an open, pluralistic, integrated society.

In "The Invisible Man," Ralph Ellison wrote: "Our fate is to become one, and yet many. This is not prophecy, but description."

We are a long way from that goal, and the path to it is an arduous one. There will be diversions along the route from both white racists and black separatists.

But it is the only route that leads to the attainable goal—and to a goal worth attaining.

From time to time, it will be tempting to withdraw from the struggle, to seek solace in the warmth and comfort of one's own community. But in the long run we cannot do the segregationists' work for them by excluding ourselves from our fair portion of the society we helped build. Nor can we allow white institutions such as corporate America to abandon the struggle. We must work toward "the beloved community," black and white together.

Those are some of the thoughts that come to mind as I've pondered the strange, changing state of race relations today.

I hope you—the Executive Leadership Council—will partake in the action and the passion of our turbulent times, dedicated to

service and to building an open, pluralistic, integrated society.

## TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 9, 1995

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2586, referred to as "The Short-term Debt Limit Extension bill." The Republican bill before us today provides a temporary increase of \$67 billion—raising the debt limit from \$4.9 to \$4.967 trillion. However, to force the President's hand in budget negotiations, the Republicans' bill lowers the debt limit to \$4.8 trillion on December 13. The Government has never defaulted on its principal and interest payments, so why now.

The Republicans have decided that they will only increase the debt limit if the President agrees to their reconciliation and appropriation budget measures that would devastate the well-being of children, seniors, and families.

Mr. Speaker, the President has said that he will veto such measures. The President's veto is the only hope that the children of this country have against the Republicans taking away their school lunches or their immunizations. It is the only hope that seniors have against having their health care premiums double, or their heating assistance taken away. And, it is the only hope that families have against having to use their mortgage payment to pay for nursing home care of their elderly parents, or to pay for their children's college tuition.

Mr. Speaker, what H.R. 2586 really is—is the Republicans' primary assault weapon in their attack on children, seniors, and families. Can the Republicans' tax cut for the wealthy justify the need to hold the country—the children, seniors, and families hostage.

It's time for the Republicans to be up front with the American people. Just tell the American people that you will not increase the debt limit unless the President agrees to gutting Medicare, destroying Medicaid, denying college students financial aid, and reducing nutrition programs for children.

There is no good faith in H.R. 2586. It includes provisions that cannot stand the scrutiny of hearings and real legislative debate from balancing the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable, to repealing habeas corpus, to dismantling the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand up for the rights of the American people, push for a clean debt limit measure. Vote "no" on H.R. 2586.

## DEBT CEILING

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 13, 1995

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week on this floor I wanted the Congress to enact a clean debt ceiling extension; we failed to do it. We did not act responsibly.

Once again, we have a chance to enact legislation. Instead, we are voting on a motion